UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,391	01/13/2006	Kohei Nanbu	1254-0302PUS1	8971
	7590 04/07/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH VA 22040 0747	HUGHES, JAMES P		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2883	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/07/2009	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/564,391	NANBU ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JAMES P. HUGHES	2883				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 De</u>	ecember 2008					
<i>i</i> —	/ <del>-</del>					
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	pa					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-23</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-23</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 December 2008</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 072508.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal Pa 6)  Other:	nte				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on December 3, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the claimed limitations are not obvious over Merrill.

Applicant argues that Merrill the problem Merrill is attempting to solve is that of "contact between the film edges and the internal bounding edges of the frame" (Amend. P. 9) rather than that of coefficient of linear expansion as the instant claims recite as their design parameter. (See Amend. P. 9-11, claim 1, 16 and 23.) Respectfully, these arguments for the allowance of the instant product claims are not persuasive. As indicated in the rejection of the claims, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to compensate for thermal expansion via anisotropic thermal expansion coefficients such that distortion due to thermal expansion of the sheets will be reduced to design for the warping effect contemplated by Merrill. This follows from the notoriously well known knowledge that warping may be caused by thermal differences and that of different thermal expansion coefficients. Anisotropic thermal expansion coefficients will allow for uniform expansion and shrinking of the sheets in all directions, thereby compensating for warping.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

<sup>(</sup>a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2883

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merrill et al. (6,160,663). Merrill et al. (6,160,663) herein after referred to as "Merrill," teaches a backlight unit comprising: a backlight—light guide (108)—a first reflective polarizing sheet (114) and a second optical sheet (e.g. brightening film 112) that is optically different from the first sheet disposed adjacently to the first sheet in a separable manner in a direction normal to the plane thereof. Merrill further teaches that sheets 114, 112, 106, 110 may have anisotropic thermal expansion coefficients designed such that distortion due to thermal expansion of the sheets will be reduced.

Merrill does not expressly teach that the coefficient of linear expansion of the second optical sheet in the direction corresponding to the first direction is approximated to the coefficient of linear expansion of the first optical sheet in the first direction. However, this design choice, in addition to sheet placement and material selection, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because it would have been obvious to try to various combinations of sheets with anisotropic thermal expansion coeiffients to reduce distortion (e.g., warping) from thermal effects as Merrill identifies as beneficial.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES P. HUGHES whose telephone number is (571)272-2474. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Font can be reached on 571-272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James P. Hughes/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2883